

No. 92 March 1976

Spearhead

15p



Bilderberg boss on corruption charge

TAHW
WE
THINK

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

After Angola

Through its own cowardice and indecision, the West has suffered a grave defeat in Angola. It is grave because that defeat has a far wider impact than simply the loss of one more far-away country to the Soviet Imperium.

The ultimate design of international Marxism in Africa is not just the seizure of Angola but the seizure of Rhodesia and South Africa. That is what the Angolan disaster is really about. The forces of Communism, flushed with victory, now stand within striking distance of Rhodesia itself, and on the verge of success in their long-planned design against the whole of white-ruled Southern Africa. Victory is in sight because of the capture of Angola — and the West did absolutely nothing to stop it.

There can be no doubt that international Marxism has taken that lesson to heart. The West was challenged by the naked military intervention in Africa of the Soviet Union, and of its Cuban satel-

lite which provided a mercenary army of 15,000 men. The response of Britain and of the "Western alliance" to that challenge was pathetic and humiliating. Hypnotised like a rabbit before a snake, Western liberalism yet again allowed armed Communist aggression to triumph without even a finger of rebuke being raised against it. It would be idle to think that Communism does not intend to capitalise upon this further proof of Western and British feebleness.

We can now expect with certainty a Soviet-supported attack on Southern Africa. The Cuban army with some 300 Soviet tanks and armoured cars is within easy reach of South West Africa and the western borders of Rhodesia. At the same time, Soviet weaponry and Cuban troops are already being transferred to Mozambique, where they will be used to re-inforce African guerrilla attacks on Rhodesia's eastern border.

What would the British Government do in the event of such an onslaught? It is, alas, certain that the British Government would do nothing to defend Rhodesia from attack, not the least reason being the predominance of the worst type of reds in the Labour party, who would rather see the hammer and sickle fly over Salisbury and Johannesburg than come to the aid of Ian Smith or the land of apartheid. Every conceivable form of weaponry required for the defence of Rhodesia and South Africa should be supplied to them, a British naval force should be despatched immediately to the Southern Atlantic to counter the Soviet fleet, and the gravest of warnings should be given to the Soviet Union as to the consequences of further aggression.

Of course, none of these requirements will be met, even though Southern Africa is the life-line of Britain and Europe. Rhodesia and South Africa stand alone, but for the staunchest support of every patriotic

man and woman in Britain. They say: Stand by the Whites in Africa!

Iniquities of the Race Bill

The new Race Relations Bill has now been published, the Bill that is intended, once and for all, to stifle the voice of anyone opposed to a multi-racial society in Britain, and to enforce it with even greater ruthlessness on the reluctant people of this country.

The new Bill, even more than previous legislation, is a mortal blow against the freedom of speech for which thirty years ago the young people of Britain were told they were fighting. The purpose behind the abolition of the intent provision, whereby it had to be proved that a person intended to stir up racial hatred by what he said or wrote, is to make it that much simpler to prosecute a party like the National Front for raising its voice against coloured immigration. All that is necessary now is that something should be deemed 'abusive' or 'insulting' and 'likely' to cause racial hatred. Such a definition is obviously so subjective that a scientific article by Prof. Eysenck on differences in intelligence between the black and white races could be considered a 'likely' cause of such incitement, or even a review of it in the columns of *Spearhead*.

This assault by the Labour Government on free speech is, to say the least, ironical in view of the fact that Britain is a signatory to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of which states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers". What utter hypocrites the Socialists are.

As though this were not enough, the Bill further proposes what amounts to the abolition of the private club as we have known it in this country. Home Secretary Jenkins has decided to overturn two House of Lords judgments and compel 4,000 working men's clubs to open their doors to anyone, regardless of race, whether they like it or not. And the Bill encourages magistrates to deny a club its license if members decide to associate with whom they please. There's democracy for you.

The new Race Relations Bill is an attack on the very basis of the traditional British way of life, destroying as it does the rights of free expression and free association. It has got to be fought all the way, and if passed, outmanoeuvred at every turn.

Communism with a human face?

The 22nd Congress of the French Communist party opened last month, with the predictable attempt to project the illusion of independence from Moscow and an image of Communism with a human face. What is alarming is that such a large proportion of voters in France are apparently taken

S P E A R H E A D

No. 92 MARCH 1976

Office: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex (Tel: 01-977 2452)

Publisher: John Tyndall

Editor: Richard Verrall B.A. Contributing Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

in by this fraudulent conversion of Communism to humanitarian ideals.

M. Marchais, the party leader, stated with reference to the Soviet Union: "We cannot accept that Communist ideals should be sullied by unjust or unjustified acts. Such acts are in no way an inevitable consequence of Socialism". This remark was certainly topical, in view of the horrifying revelations of Leonid Plyusch, the Ukrainian mathematician who was interned in a Soviet mental hospital for dissident opinions, and who was treated with mind-bending drugs although perfectly sane.

Doubtless a lot of left-wing idealists in the West actually do believe that this sort of thing is not an "inevitable consequence of Socialism", for 'Socialists' are notoriously naive about their own inhuman ideology. The truth is that such acts are an inevitable consequence of Socialism, and will always be so, because Socialism requires the levelling down of everything and everybody to an artificial and stultifying sameness. Sameness in thought, particularly, is the essence of Socialism, for after all, who could not possibly see the rightness of the State once the glorious Marxist paradise had been realised on earth? Anyone who did not do so must obviously be mentally disturbed — a suitable case for treatment.

If the French Communist party leader was himself being naive about the nature of his creed, he was certainly not being naive when speaking about the party's independence from Moscow. That was pure calculation, a crafty ploy to allay the fears of the general public and stress their impeccable democratic credentials as the party gets closer and closer to political power through the ballot box. Do 35 per cent of French voters really believe that Moscow would allow a Western European country to follow "its own national road to Socialism"? If they do, then Mr Dubcek must be thinking that they have very short memories.

Right wing extremism

While French Communists have been pretending to be Western-orientated democrats, President Ford entered the Primary elections for the Republican nomination pretending to be a conservative. This ploy was thought necessary in order to outdo his opponent for the nomination, conservative Ronald Reagan.

American voters, however, were not fooled, and so the Ford campaign switched its tactics and reverted to an argument that we have often heard in this country. According to President Ford, Reagan is "too conservative" to be a viable candidate. "I believe", said Ford, "that anyone to the right of me, Democrat or Republican, cannot win a national election".

Being to the right of Gerald Ford is not very difficult (Reagan is by no means our idea of a genuine conservative), so what the President's statement really amounts to

is that nobody but a liberal can have a sufficiently broad-based appeal to win a national election. This is the kind of talk we have heard from the influential leftist sections of the Conservative party such as the Tory Reform Group. People like Peter Walker and Robert Carr are forever warning the Conservatives that they "must not abandon the middle ground", otherwise they will be "destined for permanent opposition".

One sometimes wonders whether the kind of politicians who advance this argument live in the same world as we do. The mass of ordinary people, both in this country and the United States, are conservative in outlook. They are fundamentally patriotic, and sick to death of multi-racialism and all the other leftist liberal policies foisted on them. That most people in Britain sympathise with the political outlook of the National Front is proved time and again by opinion polls.

The only reason why such people do not give electoral expression to their views is that they are deprived of a genuine alternative, or when they are given one, they are bulldozed by a massive media campaign designed to portray that alternative as a rampant fascist or someone with his finger permanently on the atomic button. It is in this sense of course that Ford is right. Candidates on the genuine right of the political spectrum do have an uphill struggle against 'acceptable' liberals. But not for lack of popular support. It is because the whole might of the Establishment, with its control of the media, is ranged against them.

A cautionary tale

Amidst the furore surrounding Jeremy Thorpe's alleged sexual relationship with an out-of-work author, his involvement in the collapse of the London and County banking group went largely unnoticed, despite the intense embarrassment it caused to the Liberal party.

The tendency for Establishment politicians to get involved in shady banking and investment concerns (Reginald Maudling's association with shyster Hoffman and the Real Estate Fund of America comes to mind) is a remarkable one. The frequency of such involvement suggests that we are dealing with a law of averages; so interconnected are the worlds of banking and politics that bites by politicians on the more rotten apples of banksterdom are certain to occur with some regularity.

This situation is apparently recognised both by City pundits and by establishment politicians. Jeremy Thorpe, for example, thought that his "venture into secondary banking must remain a cautionary tale for any leading politician". In other words, to be a successful politician today, operate in the bankers' big league. Impressed by what he thought was the "genius and drive" of L & C's managing director Gerald Caplan,

Jeremy Thorpe obviously forgot this number one rule. The results of Mr Caplan's genius and drive are now being investigated by the Fraud Squad.

Such an oversight on Thorpe's part was not really excusable, for the City Page writer of the *Daily Telegraph* (obviously aware of the rule himself) warned him as early as 1972:

"But London and County is not the National Westminster . . . It is not Lazards. It is not Warburgs. It is not Hill Samuel. If I were leader of the Liberal party, conscious as perhaps Mr Maudling should have been conscious, of the value of my name to a business, these are the calibre of name I should regard as giving me as much dignity as I lent them."

Mmmm.

What's in a name?

Pornography has been in the news again. Following the unsuccessful prosecution of the book *Inside Linda Lovelace*, a pornography distributor who sold material described as "the filthiest and most revolting kind imaginable" was jailed for 12 months recently.

Cases of this sort are always of interest with respect to the identities of those people involved in making profits out of depravity and corruption. The major pornography case prior to the recent trials concerned a certain Gold Star Publications owned by Messrs Gold, who appeared in court charged with publishing obscene material for gain.

The notorious book *Inside Linda Lovelace* was published by Heinrich Hanau Publications, although to the great delight of those progressives interested in the progressive erosion of society, this book was judged not to be obscene.

Progressives received a set-back, however, with the sentence to 12 months imprisonment of Mr Brian Jacobs, who was convicted of possessing obscene material for publication for gain. The material, which included films of acts involving women and animals, was defended by defence witness Mr Maurice Jaffe, a "clinical psychologist" who told the court he believed it was "very valuable in relieving sexual tensions".

Mr Jacobs was defended by Mr David Fingleton.

One's attention is arrested by what is evidently a heavy minority involvement in the pornography racket, and this is confirmed by reports from America on those behind the publication and distribution of obscene books and films, as well as by the identities of many an obscene film director such as Russ Meyer and film actress such as Romy Schneider. Those who believe that race is an unimportant factor in the workings of the world might note this minority overrepresentation. The tendency of minority groups to participate in activities that are corrosive to Western society cannot be ignored.

White birth rate slumps in Britain...

THE economy is not the only thing on a downward spiral in Britain today. An even greater danger is posed by the fact that our indigenous white birth rate has been steadily falling ever since the mid-Sixties. And figures released recently by the Registrar General show that the downward trend is continuing. This is happening, of course, at a time of increasing coloured immigration and a soaring black birth rate.

In the middle of the last century, the number of live births per thousand of the population was about 35; the latest figures show it has now come down to a mere 13.7, which is even lower than the birth slump of the 1930s when the figure dropped to 14.

The causes of this drastic fall in the white British birth rate are several. The pill, which came on the market in 1961, is certainly a factor, since the birth rate began to go down three years later. But it has more to do with the reckless atmosphere in which contraception has been promoted in this country. The frantic campaign by numerous liberal bodies to curtail the white birth rate has been a major cause, especially the promotion of the ever-expanding family planning industry, soon to go on the National Health. In Aberdeen, which has had a free service since 1967, the birth rate is now nearing replacement level.

Another contributory cause is undoubtedly our appallingly lax abortion laws, which came into operation in 1967 after a concerted campaign by all the devotees of liberalism. In 1973 there were an estimated 60,000 abortions on British women, a figure which would have made a substantial difference to the 674,000 live births recorded for that year.

And in the Commonwealth...

THE same downward trend in the white birth rate is occurring elsewhere among peoples of British stock, particularly in Australia, a country of a mere 13 million inhabitants.

The same forces have been at work there, and the result has been that in a country of nearly 3,000,000 square miles, more than two and a half times the size of India with its teeming masses, the white birth rate has sunk to the lowest for 32 years.

In 1973 the birth rate was only 18.31 per thousand of the population, and the figure for 1974 was even lower.

...But Black birth rate soars

WHILE liberals and 'environmentalists' have mounted an intensive pressure campaign for a zero white population growth, the coloured birth rate continues to soar unchecked.


The very basis of the British future has been under attack on the grounds of a so-called "population explosion", but so far as the British people and all white Europeans are concerned, this 'explosion' is non-existent. The only 'exploding' population is that of the coloured races both in Britain and, of course, throughout the Third World. Yet it is the creative, white peoples of the world who are urged to curtail their births, and they are encouraged to do this by the very same liberals who promote the immigration into Britain of millions of coloured aliens, renowned for their uncontrollable fecundity.

To gain some idea of what this really means, consider the fact that while there were 60,000 abortions on British women in 1973, there were approximately 50,000 coloured immigrant births that year! There were also no less than 86,000 coloured immigrants entering the country, the majority of them of child-bearing age, and 34,044 immigrants given British citizenship. This is simply a recipe for national suicide.

What is happening is that every year the total white British birth rate falls, while the percentage of births to coloured immigrants rises. According to the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, the births to coloured or "New Commonwealth" immigrants in Britain rose from 5.9 per cent of all births in 1969 to 6.3 per cent in 1974. The white birth rate, however, suffered a steep fall for the fourth year running. All evidence shows that this alien birth rate is, in fact, increasing at a much more alarming rate, in some areas approaching 50% in less than two years.



The changing face of a South London street



White birth rate slumps...

What is the answer?

THE answer to this disastrous state of affairs is simply the implementation of the policies of the National Front. First and foremost is the repatriation of those alien races whose increasing expansion in this country amounts to a direct threat to the British future. Secondly, we must put an end to the growing frenzy of "population control" and "family planning", which besides smacking of political totalitarianism and State interference, is progressively creating an enfeebled British population in which a decreasing proportion of young will have to support an increasing proportion of elderly. In contrast to the Establishment parties, we must encourage a vigorous birth rate in Britain, and any dangers of overpopulation must be overcome by promoting a high rate of emigration of British people to the White Dominions overseas.

THE RESPONSE of the present Labour Government to the existing and potential threat posed by the electoral triumphs — they can be regarded as nothing less — of the Scottish National Party, the White Paper on Devolution, appears to be considered by most Scots as at best ill — conceived and at worst a downright insult! If the present success of Scottish Nationalism is based on a reaction to Westminster-inspired bad government by an increasing number of Scots, it is unlikely to be appeased by the emergence of yet another level of government (albeit with the window-dressing of an Assembly), increased numbers of Civil Servants and a Secretary of State who possesses considerable powers granted by Westminster, and who is thus bound to become the 'enemy' of an almost certainly nationalist-inclined Assembly in the quite likely event of a conflict between Westminster and Edinburgh.

Even the establishment press has castigated the Labour Government for its proposals:—

"Judged even by the Labour Party's own narrow and politically expedient view of throwing out devolutionist sopps to Edinburgh and Cardiff to halt the nationalist advance, the White Paper is more of a liability than an asset." (*The Economist*)

The reaction to the White Paper in Scotland was, as might have been expected, to give the Scottish National Party increased popular support. This was illustrated at the Regional Council by-elections on 2 December 1975 at Bo'ness and Bishopbriggs, which the Nationalists won with 'swings' of well over 30%. Although one should not try to over-emphasise the importance of two regional results, the extent of the nationalist victories seems a possible portent for the future. Few people would now wish to dispute the possibility of there being between 20-40 SNP MP's in the next few years. The danger is now that Scottish Nationalism may be carried along by its own momentum and by such ill-conceived ideas as the present White Paper until complete separation appears credible, desirable and respectable to the majority of Scots.

ECONOMIC STAGNATION

It is undeniable that Scotland has suffered the results of bad government by both major parties in recent years, and this fact has undoubtedly affected many Scots in becoming more amenable to the ideas of the SNP. Since 1945, those older industries on which Scotland once relied, shipbuilding, mining and heavy engineering, have been in a state of decline. One major result of this was that even during the "Age of Affluence", Scotland had a higher rate of unemployment than almost anywhere else in Britain, well over 50,000 in the mid-fifties. Thus by 1964, the majority of Scots looked to the Labour Party to take effective action to revive the

ROBERT GREGORY

Scottish Nationalism: A design to weaken the U.K.?

Scottish sector of the economy and thus reduce unemployment. There also existed the hope that a Labour Government would, in conjunction with the largely Labour-controlled local authorities, particularly in the Glasgow area, take action to improve the state and condition of Housing, in certain areas among the worst in Western Europe. However these hopes were largely disappointed. Regional planning, which was supposed to provide areas of stagnation with money and resources as well as to encourage capital investment and thus revitalise the economy, was not a success. This policy largely failed because in the period 1965-1970, as Britain's economic problems multiplied, less money and resources could be found for areas of stagnation such as Scotland, and investment in the area remained comparatively low. One result of the failure of this policy was increasing disillusion with London-based central government felt by many Scots, which found expression in the first upsurge of Scottish Nationalism in the period 1966-1970. After the failure of the Labour Government the accession of the Conservatives to power was viewed, if not with great expectation, at least with the faint hope that they would produce policies to restore a degree of prosperity to areas of relative stagnation such as Scotland. The lack of any major initiative in this area by the Conservative Government between 1970 and 1974 helped undermine the support of many of the Tory faithful in Scotland and resulted in many of them being lured by the 'tempting' fruits of Scottish Nationalism.

The economic decline, the continuing high level of unemployment and the discovery of oil have all proved advantageous to the SNP in the 1970's. They have been galvanised to ever greater efforts, until finally they achieved their present position as the most popular political party in Scotland. Such a position is likely to improve even further if the Scots feel that they are being thrown devolutionist sopps by a panic-stricken government concerned only with its future hold on office and ability to govern.

ALL BRITAIN BETRAYED

Although it is correct to say that Scotland has suffered the results of bad government, both Labour and Conservative, it is not alone in that melancholy distinction, for the United Kingdom as a whole has

suffered the results of bad government by both major parties, particularly since the Second World War. Whether one considers economic policies, the surrender of the Empire, the introduction of huge numbers of aliens into Britain or the betrayal over entry into the European Community by all the liberal-left Establishment parties, it is the United Kingdom as a whole that has suffered, not simply one city or area. If the policies of those who have misgoverned and betrayed Britain for the last thirty years are to be reversed, they must be reversed by a political party that represents the United Kingdom as a whole and considers the British interest of paramount importance, not by a shallow 'nationalism' whose end result would be likely to create parties and factions similar to those that have been responsible for most of Britain's present ills.

If separation, the ultimate objective of the Scottish National Party, were ever achieved, those who would benefit the most are those to whom it is of the greatest advantage to have an increasingly weak, divided and impotent Britain. It is obviously in the interest of all the different elements who seek the destruction of Britain — Marxists, Trotskyites, multi-racialists, Internationalists etc — to have a Britain divided into smaller and weaker component parts which would thus be easier to destroy and then rule.

British Nationalism is the only form of nationalism that is in the true interest of the British people, in that it is the only form of nationalism which represents British interests as a whole and not sectional interests. All areas of the United Kingdom are entitled to effective and efficient government, and in certain spheres devolved powers may be appropriate, but if some powers are to be devolved they should be devolved only within a United Kingdom context and not as an initial step on the road to complete separation. Scottish Nationalism is unlikely to solve the numerous problems that have bedeviled both Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom in recent years because its very success would create new problems and divisions in a weakened state.

Only a strong and effective British Nationalism led by a vigorous British Nationalist Party can hope to save the United Kingdom as a whole from an accelerating rate of decline and eventual destruction. It is this task to which all British Nationalists, including the proud Scots, must address themselves in future.

The Jewish Question: Out in the open or under the carpet?

IF there is one issue in politics which it is almost impossible to discuss today in an atmosphere of calm and objective analysis, it is the much written about 'Jewish Question'.

Mere mention of this subject, or even of the words 'Jew' or 'Jewish', is liable to send otherwise perfectly rational people into fits of nervous hysterics which put sober debate out of the question. People who will frankly and openly debate the virtues and vices of other races will, when the Jews are mentioned, either shuffle their feet and look abstractly towards the window or ceiling, or partake in the discussion with lowered voice and roving eyes indicative of a weird guilt feeling and a terror that their remarks might be going down on record with dire consequences to themselves at a later date.

I have regularly received letters over the years taking me to task for articles and speeches mentioning Jews not always in a favourable light, and the nature of the protest is always the same: I should not talk about Jews in even a faintly critical way because to do so would get me branded as an 'anti-Semite' and any organisation I represented as an 'anti-Semitic' organisation.

What is most interesting is that the same people never object to much stronger remarks against Blacks, Asians or Irish on the grounds that these will invite the labels of 'anti-Black', 'anti-Asian', or anti-Irish'. Such labels, whether earned or not, are not considered to be really heavy crosses to bear. 'Anti-Semitic', on the other hand, seems to represent almost the last word in sinfulness — a label to be avoided at all costs.

This complex that many quite well informed and intelligent people have regarding mention of the Jewish Question would seem to me indicative of nothing if not the hypnotic effects of Jewish power. Readers may shoot me down if they wish, but I believe that this policy of trying to sweep the Jewish Question under the carpet is neither right nor sensible.

THE FRINGE

There is a particularly gutter form of anti-Jewish behaviour which manifests itself in things like bricks heaved through Jewish shop windows and calculated insults of Jews for no other reason than that they are Jews.

These practices I find repellent, and from the political point of view they are not only morally wrong but in every sense stupid and counter-productive. On the rare occasions when we have encountered people of this disposition on the fringes of our movement, we have done everything possible to keep them at arm's length. Any manifestation of such conduct by members is liable to result in rapid expulsion.

But there is also an opposite extreme which is equally non-productive to a satisfactory Jew-Gentile relationship. This is the pretence that there is no such thing as a Jewish Question and that the enormously influential role of Jews in modern political thought and action is of no more significance than the tendency of Irishmen to work on building sites or Italians in the restaurant trade.

What must first be understood is that Jewish political flair is not just a flair for politics as such; if it were, Jews would be found to be active in every part of the political spectrum, Right, Left and Centre. As it is, Jewish political genius and energy is almost entirely directed towards the Left side of politics and very often towards the extreme Left side. Very rarely are Jews to be found on the political right, and more rarely still identified with any nationalist or patriotic cause other than a Jewish one.

BEHIND COMMUNISM

It is an incontestable fact that Communism, both as doctrine and revolutionary movement, owes more to the Jews than to any other race. Marx himself was of Jewish stock, while of the early political leadership of Russia after 1917 almost all except Lenin were Jews. The 'Russian' Revolution was financed mainly by Jewish bankers in the United States, Germany and Sweden. 'German' Communism was of no different origins — apart from Marx himself, Lassalle, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg (all Jews) being the most prominent promoters. To this day almost the entire leadership of the Communist Party of the United States has been Jewish. In Britain, where the most dangerous Communist influences have always been found within the Left Wing of the Labour Party, Jews such as Mikardo, Mendelsohn, Allaun, Freeson, Lestor and Rose are well to the fore.

To state these facts is not to be 'anti-

Jewish' any more than to state the Sicilian flavour of the Mafia is to be 'anti-Sicilian'. The majority of Sicilians may indeed loathe the Mafia, just as the majority of Jews may not wish to impose Communist tyranny on the world, but this does not mean that when the menace of the Mafia is studied with a view to bringing that organisation to justice its Sicilian origins and composition can be ignored.

Just think how ludicrous it would be if all police investigators working on Mafia cases and seeking to arrest and bring to trial Mafia bosses were instructed to dismiss the Sicilian element as being of no account, and in their surveillance of Mafia suspects to keep no closer watch on the Sicilian community than upon communities of Poles, Chinese or Mexicans. Yet today there are some who demand that the Western World defend itself against Communism while not acknowledging that there is any special Jewish role in the creation of Communism! Trying to understand Communism while ignoring its Jewish pedigree is about as hopeful a project as trying to understand the Mafia while pretending it is Polish or trying to understand Christianity while believing that it originated in the Australian bush.

If we acknowledge Jews, then, as the principal promoters of Communism, it means that there is a Jewish Question — whatever different opinions we may come to as to what should be done about that question — and that the question must be openly and candidly discussed.

THROUGHOUT THE AGES

Another way of coming to the same conclusion is to survey the thread of 'anti-Semitism' throughout the ages. For a very long time the Jews have been, at various moments, the victims of pogroms in almost every part of the world where they have congregated in large numbers. They suffered the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and their expulsion from that area in 135 AD. They were similarly expelled from England in 1290 by Edward I after a hundred years of intense persecution. Thousands of them were killed or expelled from Spain during the Inquisition. They constantly suffered both private and official harassment in Russia under the Tsars. They were the main victims, as we all know, of the racial policies of Nazi Germany. In France and America anti-Jewish doctrines have always had a wide circulation.

Just how are we to explain this recurring phenomenon? The most commonly publicised explanation, and the one most often offered up by 'pro-Semites' everywhere, is that the Jews are a race of exceptional talents whose achievements incite envy in others and in due course give rise to campaigns of hatred and, eventually, persecution against them.

That might be so, but is it not also the

case that the British, the Germans, the French, the Italians and the Spanish are races which at various times have exhibited great genius and made a mark on the world of far more distinction than that of most other nations? Yet is there in their case anything remotely comparable to the doctrine and legend of 'anti-Semitism' that has for centuries followed the development of the Jews?

It may be said that races like the Greeks and the Armenians have at times displayed the commercial sharpness and acumen that we generally associate with Jewish people, and in consequence risen above races around them to live in fine mansions as financiers, bankers and money-lenders. But there is no 'anti-Greek' or 'anti-Armenian' doctrine as such.

Why then has the Jewish genius, and its attendant achievement, given rise to a form of anti-Jewishness that goes far beyond any comparable antagonism towards other notable peoples as a result of their successes?

Whatever the answer, the fact itself establishes once again that there is a Jewish Question, from which we cannot escape, whatever our discomfort is acknowledging it.

WHENCE THE DOCTRINE?

What is it that makes 'anti-Semitism' a doctrine, as distinct from merely a sentiment? It is, of course, the theory of a Jewish plan for world conquest, a theory which has found expression in numerous writings but is best known as the central theme in the famous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

Ever since this document appeared in Russia in the 1890s there has been argument about its authenticity, and it may indeed be that it was, as the Jews claim, a forgery concocted by the Tsarist political police in order to justify draconian measures against them.

But to assume that the whole Jewish Question hangs on the authenticity or otherwise of the *Protocols* is to miss the point. What is it that distinguishes the novelists who earn, universally, the description of 'great' and whose works form a part of the heritage of the most cultured communities the world over, from the ordinary cheap thriller-writers who perhaps earn big royalties but who are seldom acknowledged as making any contribution to the enrichment of the mind? It is, of course, that the really great writer, while his story is fiction, bases that story on true phenomena of life which millions can immediately recognise as paralleling their own experiences. If this were not so, such writers would never be taken seriously and passionately discussed wherever people of intellect met.

Likewise the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* would not have been printed in dozens of languages and read earnestly by millions of people in scores of countries

outside Russia — sometimes becoming officially sponsored by states — if they did not contain observations that were immediately recognisable by a great many people as fitting the picture of the world that they saw themselves — in countries far from Russia and in periods far removed in time from that in which the *Protocols* first appeared.

A subject such as that contained in the *Protocols* is one which, by virtue of the fame or notoriety (take your pick) that it has achieved, at least qualifies to be discussed, and I propose, so long as I have influence over the policy of this journal, that these columns will be used to discuss it.

ONUS OF PROOF

In my view it is incumbent on the Jews who dislike the theme of the *Protocols*, not to prove that the book itself is a forgery, but to prove that the theme contained in it is wrong. This they would do much more convincingly but for a certain important fact that is evident to all students of the Jewish role in political affairs.

The fact very simply is this: Jewry constantly maintains a double standard by which it identifies itself with an intense Jewish nationalism and Jewish racial consciousness, while simultaneously it will always be found among the forces of opposition to nationalism and race consciousness where they manifest themselves in non-Jewish communities. Among the forces of opposition and indeed more often than not in the forefront of those forces.

This attitude was well summed up by no less a Jew than Henry Kissinger, when he told the United Nations General Assembly in 1973:

"In an age of potential nuclear cataclysm . . . our most urgent task is to overcome these apparently iron laws of history . . . These challenges cannot be solved by a world fragmented into self-contained nation-states, but only by co-operation in a world community . . . The vision of a world community is the necessity of our age . . ."

The theme of a 'world-community' runs right through the writings and speeches of leading Jews everywhere, and it may be said that no race on earth has done more to undermine the idea of the nation-state than the Jews. Whether one believes this is for good or ill, it is a scarcely contested fact.

Every nation-state, that is, except the Jewish nation-state. Here, as in so many other things, a different rule operates for the Jews from that for the Gentiles. Jews, rather than integrate themselves in the broader communities of the countries in which they settle, operate an intensive form of exclusiveness, even *apartheid*, which separates them from others. Consider the following statement made by the National Committee for Furtherance of Jewish Education in the U.S.A. and published in the *New York Times* as an advertisement:

"Intermarriage is suicide — national and personal! There is no surer way to destroy the Jewish people than to marry out of the Faith. Unchecked, the present trend of young Jewish boys and girls to choose mates of other or no religious affiliations will slowly but surely wipe out the unique Jewish identity."

Then consider a statement made by AJEX (The Association of Jewish Ex-servicemen and Women) in Britain recently to the effect that, as reported in the *Jewish Chronicle*, it was:

"... intensifying its war on extremists and neo-fascists in a bid to stop the spread of overt racism during the present economic difficulties in Britain."

The report went on to say that:

"Wherever possible AJEX was concerned to prevent extremist (i.e. racist) organisations from having a platform . . ."

and that

"... defence seminars were being organised throughout Britain to advise Jewish groups, particularly young people . . . so that racist activities . . . could be more effectively countered."

So here we have Jewry one moment advising its young people in passionate tones not to "marry out of the faith", and the next moment setting up seminars to advise those same young people how to counter "racist activities" on the part of Gentiles.

'WORLD-COMMUNITY'

Reverting back to Mr. Kissinger's 'world community', we find an echo in the *Protocols*:

"In the place of existing governments we will place a monster, which will be called the Administration of the Super-Government. Its hands will be outstretched like far-reaching pincers, and it will have such an organisation at its disposal that it will not possibly be able to fail in subduing all countries."

Indeed, as conceded before, the *Protocols* may be a forgery, but they prophecy so much of what is happening in the world today that they must be, to say the least, a damned good forgery. Perhaps the very 'organisation' of which they speak in the quoted passage is that of the United Nations to which Mr. Kissinger was addressing his message of faith.

Nowhere has the Jewish problem been better summed up than in the words of a *Jewish Chronicle* journalist to my colleague, Martin Webster. The journalist said:

"You must understand that we Jews are cosmopolitan and international. We are a guest community wherever we are, and we can only thrive in liberal, international and cosmopolitan societies."

"You people are nationalists. We know what that means. Even if at the moment you had no ex-Nazi or Fascist members whatsoever . . . we would still have to oppose you . . . we have to fight you from the outset."

This is merely a reiteration of the attitude of Jewry before the war in as much as it affected Mosley's British Union movement. When that movement began it had no anti-Jewish policy, but right from the start certain elements among the Jewish community re-

Contd. on page 15

SOCIALIST TYRANNY

Labour denies freedom of speech to NF in Wolverhampton...

THE Labour Party has shown itself in its true colours once more by banning the National Front from using schools and other public buildings in Wolverhampton for its meetings. The decision taken by the Labour-controlled Council has caused a furore in the town, with members of the public, the Association of Ratepayers and even Tory councillors publicly expressing their indignation at Socialist tyranny. Indeed, the Labour Party has practised the very 'fascist' tactics against opposition groups of which they are always accusing the National Front. What utter hypocrisy! The Socialists have the effrontery to claim that the NF is a threat to freedom of speech, but clearly the only threat to free speech in Wolverhampton comes from the Labour party itself.

Incredibly, the Council ban against the NF was the result of a campaign started by a minority extremist group, the Wolverhampton Indian Workers Association, a Marxist-orientated outfit presided over by a

certain Naranjan Singh Noor, who called on the Council to ban the NF from using its property because the National Front is "working against a multi-racial society".

PUBLIC OUTCRY

A week later, the Wolverhampton *Express & Star* revealed that Labour councillors were planning just such a ban on the NF. At a meeting of the Council's building sub-committee, Socialist councillors defeated the Tories in a 5-4 vote to prevent the NF from exercising its right of free speech in local authority buildings. Tory Councillor Alan Bickley described the move as "repugnant and a denial of freedom of expression". Even local lefties in the Young Conservatives denounced the vote as a "dangerous attack on democracy".

The public outcry against Socialist intolerance evidently shook the Labour party, since our old friend Mrs Renee Short

MP, a renowned left-wing extremist, felt it necessary to come to the aid of her Labour Council friends before the crucial meeting of the education committee which was to discuss the decision. Mrs Short told the Press that she was in favour of banning 'extremists', though her definition of this term did not embrace the Communist party or other red revolutionaries, to whom she had no wish to deny freedom of speech.

After a furious row between members of the education committee, the NF was finally banned, with a substantial majority voting in favour. Cllr. Mordecai James declared that he was "not prepared to let these people lacerate our heritage of a free democracy"! Apparently, Mordecai's method of preserving our democratic heritage is also to stifle freedom of speech.

Mr. Graham Jones, Wolverhampton NF Branch's press officer, immediately announced their intention of holding open-air meetings if necessary. "We shall not be silenced", he said.

...But Trades Council Reds fail in Norwich


THE same methods have been tried in Norwich to prevent the National Front from having a voice in the trade union movement, but this time they failed.

The campaign started in December of last year at a meeting of the joint Labour Party and Trades Council in Norwich.

National Front Norwich Organiser William Fitt had been elected to the Trades Council as one of the three delegates from the local branch of the Transport & General Workers Union, and of course the Reds saw red. The fact that Bill Fitt was a member of the National Front was immediately reported by one of the other delegates, a card-carrying Communist, to the powerful red faction on the Trades Council. A campaign of persecution was naturally the result.

The last straw for the Communists seems to have been the fact that Bill Fitt was invited to speak to pupils at the local Thorpe Grammar School, where he explained National Front policy to the political club. An International Socialist at the school and a delegate to the Trades Council reported this event to the outraged reds there, and rumours began circulating that Bill Fitt would never be allowed to take his seat on the Council.

Soon after, at a December meeting of the Council, delegate Mr. John Gubbay asked if the new trades council rules could be 'framed' (the operative word) to prevent the National Front from sending delegates. A motion was then unconstitutionally



BILL FITT

bulldozed through the meeting which insisted that delegates sign a declaration that they were not members of a 'fascist' organisation, but a vigorous protest was made against these tactics by NALGO representatives.

The motion required endorsement at the annual meeting of the Norwich Trades Council in February, and Bill Fitt presented himself at the meeting with the full support of his local TGWU Branch. Wearing his NF Gold Badge, he explained in his speech that NF policies on immigration, International Finance and the Common Market were in the interests of all British workers. As a result, the motion to refuse Bill Fitt's credentials to represent the TGWU was finally overruled by a substantial majority.

This democratic decision was deplored in the columns of *Socialist Worker*, organ of the International Socialists, which commented that "refusal to fight the National Front can only encourage its infiltration (sic) in the labour movement..." They are certainly right about that, since the National Front has an increasing number of Trades

Council delegates who are determined to stand up for the real interests of British workers.

LABOUR EXTREMISTS

The failure in Norwich to suppress the voice of the NF in the trades unions follows an another abortive assault in Bristol last year, where a call to **legally ban the National Front as a political party** was made by Mr Brian Underwood, the Communist president of Bristol Trades Council.

"What is needed", said this advocate of democracy at the Council's monthly meeting, "is legislation to ban any sort of organisation advocating the kind of policies put forward by the Front."

This general attack on the NF was really aimed at Mr Philip Gannaway, Chairman of Bristol Branch of the National Front, who is a delegate to the Trades Council, but Mr Underwood and his Labour party friends on the Council later had to concede that they had no power to ban Mr Gannaway from attending meetings.

We can expect these sort of attacks on the NF's freedom of expression to continue, particularly from the left-wing, multi-racial extremists of the Labour party, who pose as defenders of democratic rights while seeking to deny them to the National Front. It is up to NF trade unionists in particular to expose these people for what they really are, and to show that in no way do they represent the real interests of trade union members.

The following is the text of an address delivered by the Rhodesian Prime Minister, Mr Ian Smith on Friday, 6 February 1976.

RHODESIA STANDS FIRM

DURING the last few months we have had a lull in terrorist activity in Rhodesia due largely to the dedicated and successful efforts of our security forces. This has provided a welcome respite which has enabled us to scale down the level of call-ups for Military Service and so reduce their impact on family life, on farming, on commerce and industry and on mining. We were aware, however, that preparations were being made in Tanzania and in Mozambique for the mounting of fresh terrorist incursions into Rhodesia. Our own contingency planning has been based on the expectation of such attacks on a wider front than hitherto, and we are ready for them.

The experience of anti-terrorist operations which we have gained in the last three years has stood us in good stead. This is to be seen, not only in the highly effective offensive tactics which our forces have developed in the field, but also in the defensive measures which have been adopted for the protection of farms, homes and tribal villages. But above all it is to be seen in the spirit of our people, in the quiet determination which some misguided observers mistake for complacency.

It is now clear that in the coming months our determination and our experience will be put to the test. As you are aware, there have been fresh incursions of terrorists into the border areas adjacent to Mozambique during the past fortnight and we must expect these to continue and to extend into areas which have not previously been affected. On the evidence before us, I believe that this will be the most serious incursion that we have as yet experienced. However, on the credit side, our security forces are stronger today than they have ever been. The tactics which the terrorists will employ will be the familiar and cowardly ones of indiscriminate mine-laying; of brutal murders and assaults on helpless and innocent African tribesmen; and of hit-and-run attacks on white farms. These tactics make it difficult for our forces to grapple with them and to bring them to battle. Nevertheless, in the past fortnight we have killed 14 terrorists and wounded and captured others for the loss of only one of our own men. This ratio of terrorists killed to our own losses has been fairly constant throughout the last three years and it is a measure of our ability to maintain our superiority over them.

MORAL COURAGE

To do this, however, we shall have to increase our force levels in the field, which in turn means a greater contribution by those concerned. Every effort will be made to spread the load as widely and as evenly as possible but inevitably there will be some inconvenience, there will be some hardship and there will be some interruption of family

life and of business and professional activities. The fact that our call-up net is now spread much more widely than in the past will help to make these burdens more tolerable. What will also help in this regard is the knowledge that so many men who are past the call-up age are making a voluntary contribution through organisations such as the Police Reserve and Special Reserve and Civil Defence. All of this contributes to what I might call the National Morale; that spirit which gives us the strength to resist the forces of evil which are directed against us.

We shall need this moral courage in full measure, for in the coming months we will also be subjected to psychological warfare more intensive and more insidious than ever before. We shall be urged by some people to heed the lessons of Mozambique and Angola and to surrender now in order to avoid chaos and strife such as that which is presently occurring in Angola. I say to these people that if we were to surrender the reins of Government nothing would be more certain than the inevitability of Civil War between Blacks in Rhodesia.

Nowhere in Africa are the essential ingredients for such conflict present in such stark and clear-cut form as here. Over the years there have been many attempts to remedy this situation, but the papering over of the cracks has always proved to be a temporary expedient, and sooner or later the natural divisions burst wide open again. It is only the firm and stabilising control of the Government which prevents the occasional sporadic outburst from developing into a major conflict.

We shall also be told that the fresh terrorist incursions make the attainment of a constitutional settlement all the more urgent. In anticipation of such comment I would make two points. Firstly, the only settlement which I could obtain in haste would be one involving an immediate sell out to Black rule. This, I believe is as unacceptable to you as it is to me. The kind of settlement we want cannot be achieved in haste. It can only be attained by patient negotiation and discussion in the manner of Africa. Secondly, it is well known that the terrorists operating out of Mozambique are of the Zanu Faction who regard the current negotiations as irrelevant. This is in spite of the fact that their leaders, in conjunction with the four neighbouring Presidents, gave a solemn undertaking that whilst settlement negotiations were proceeding, terrorism would be held in check.

The aim of Zanu is to secure domination over all the people of Rhodesia, including their Black rivals, and to do so by means of terrorism. Hence they must be defeated —

and decisively defeated — irrespective of whether or not constitutional discussions reach a successful conclusion.

THE MARCH OF COMMUNISM

So far I have dealt only with the internal aspects of the current situation. But there are also important and far-reaching implications in the context of Southern Africa as a whole. I refer to the onward march of Communism, of which the recent terrorist incursions into Rhodesia — trained, armed and equipped by the Marxists — are the latest spearheads. For years I, and my colleagues in Government, have drawn attention to the steadily advancing communist menace in Africa and to its implications for the free world. For years we have been ridiculed and accused of seeing a Communist behind every bush. Today even our erstwhile critics are singing a different tune, for the unfolding picture is clear for all to see. The tragic failure of the Western powers to react to the blatant Russian and Cuban aggression in Angola will have far-reaching consequences, for it has brought the Communists one step nearer to their ultimate goal in Africa. Their immediate objective is the creation of a 'saddle' across Africa, reaching from the Atlantic coast of Angola in the West, to Tanzania and Mozambique on the East Coast. This will provide them with the necessary spring-board, from which they will launch their campaign for their final Southern African goal — the complete domination of the Southern sub-continent and the denial of its vast natural resources and its communications — particularly the Cape Sea route — to the free world.

Their next targets will undoubtedly be Rhodesia and South West Africa. In each case the Russians and their Communist puppets in the OAU will invoke the aid of the free world in applying psychological pressure by claiming as they have done so often in the past — that the Governments in Rhodesia and South West Africa are illegal. The farcical nature of this claim is clear. Moreover, if one compares the stability, harmony and orderly progress of these two countries with the chaos and strife which have followed coup and counter-coup elsewhere in Africa, the accusation becomes completely ludicrous. Regrettably, however, we can anticipate that the western powers, blind to the consequences of their actions, will not only acquiesce, but will join in the chorus orchestrated by the Russian baton. Unfortunately there is no Churchill alive today to bring home to them the folly of such appeasement.

You may well ask what we in Rhodesia

Contd. on page 13

RICHARD VERRALL

BEHIND THE BRIBERY SCANDAL...

PRINCE BERNHARD AND THE BILDERBERG CONSPIRATORS

NATIONALISTS have always maintained as a central pillar of their political case that there does exist, on the highest levels of international finance and multi-national big business, a conspiracy of immensely wealthy interests to dragoon nation states into a collectivist, World Government system.

And nationalists have maintained that the method by which this coercion of nations is practised is the power of money — through currency manipulation, debt creation, and sheer bribery and corruption.

The evidence for this claim is invariably dismissed with an idle wave of the hand. Utter nonsense, a fantasy, people say. Obviously a paranoiac delusion. But recent revelations of the payment of huge bribes by the multi-national U.S. Lockheed Corporation to, among others, the president of the sinister Bilderberg Group, Prince Bernhard, is powerful confirmatory evidence.

CORRUPTION ON A WORLD SCALE

The disclosure of the Lockheed bribes is merely one chink of light from the dark, hidden world of the international politico-financial establishment. The U.S. Senate Committee on Multi-National Corporations has produced documentary evidence of payments to the former West German Defence Minister, Franz Joseph Strauss; the former Italian Defence Minister, Luigi Gui; to Japanese political leaders and high officials of NATO; and to Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands as Inspector General of the Dutch armed forces, who is charged with receiving one million dollars between 1960 and 1962 for clinching the sale of Lockheed Starfighter aircraft to Holland in preference to British Hawker Hunters. Indeed, Lockheed admit to paying a total of 22 million dollars to foreign politicians. According to Senate Committee Chairman Frank Church, the pay-offs uncovered are mainly focused in such key areas as the arms and aircraft industries and in the multi-national oil corporations. Other recent scandals of this kind have involved International Telephone & Telegraph (Kuhn, Loeb & Co.), and the Exxon Corporation, whose executive vice president is a member of the Bilderberg Group.

It is obvious to anyone that sums of the kind so far revealed are paltry compared

to the vast wealth at the command of those financiers who are ultimately the owners of such international corporations as Lockheed. And their political power is correspondingly as vast. Is it not obvious, therefore, that even greater bribes, and corrupt financial practises on an even more colossal scale can be and are the normal means of furthering internationalism used by those same wealthy interests?

The Lockheed disclosures show clearly that the means exist to operate on this level, and one can only remark that if international finance is **not** controlling and manipulating states through the power of money, why isn't it? The power to do so is there. Remember the 'prize' of £36,000 awarded to Edward Heath by the "FVS Foundation of Hamburg" for taking Britain into the E.E.C.? Little wonder that Henry Kissinger commented morosely on hearing of the corporate pay-off disclosures: "The implication of these revelations has been serious".

Numerous writers have, in fact, produced firm evidence of just such a conspiracy by wealthy internationalists, one of the best among them being A.K. Chesterton in *The New Unhappy Lords*, but more important, it has actually been admitted by a man who was close to the centre of its operation and is sympathetic to its aims. He is Prof. Carroll Quigley, and in his book *Tragedy and Hope* he openly reveals how international bankers, operating through organisations such as Prince Bernhard's secret society, the Bilderberg Group, have used nothing but the naked power of their money to erode the sovereignty of nations.

WHO ARE THE BILDERBERGERS?

Prince Bernhard, named by Dutch Prime Minister Joop den Uyl as the "high Netherlands official" who received a pay-off of one million dollars from a U.S. multi-national corporation, is president of one of the most sinister bodies active in the promotion of World Government, the Bilderberg Group.

The organisation received its name after the first meeting at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbrek, Holland, in 1954, and ever since then it has met annually in the strictest secrecy at remote locations throughout the world.

Apart from vaguely worded *communiqués* issued after the event, the subject of its discussions is carefully veiled, as are



LOCKHEED'S CHAIRMAN KOTCHIAN


He stated in evidence that 1 million dollars was funded through a Swiss agent, Hubert Weisbrod, to Prince Bernhard.

the identities of those who attend its meetings. The gatherings are never reported in the newspapers, except to say that a "Bilderberg Conference" took place.

The Rutland, Vermont *Herald*, remarking on the 1971 Bilderberg meeting at Woodstock, Vermont, commented: "The Woodstock Inn will apparently be sealed up like Fort Knox . . . No press coverage will be allowed, with the exception of issuing a statement at the close of the meeting".

The Bilderberg Group brings together international bankers, selected MPs and Prime Ministers, big business heads, civil servants, economists, intellectuals, Press and media chiefs, supposedly to discuss such lofty matters as "world peace", "international co-operation", or even more vaguely, "common problems". Why these people should meet together in the greatest cloak and dagger secrecy, who sponsors their meetings and pays their fares, what they decide and what orders are given, are matters that have always remained closely guarded.

The secrecy and the identities of the people involved, the predominance of the international banking fraternity and the wording of their *communiqués* make one thing sufficiently clear: that the Bilderberg Group is an important arm of the movement for World Government, and that those present are the chief promoters of internationalism whose aim is the abolition of nation states. *Communiqués*, for example,



Prince
Bernhard
with
Queen
Juliana

which state that "there was substantial agreement on the need to promote . . . more effective co-ordination among Western nations" (Bilderberg Conference 1961) need little interpretation when they emanate from Wall St. banking interests and their associates.

SOME OF THE CONSPIRATORS

The participants at one of the earliest meetings, held at St. Simons Island in 1957, were entered in the appendix of the Congressional Record. They included the mysterious Felix Frankfurter; representatives of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Sulzberger of the *New York Times*; Dean Acheson and Soviet agent Alger Hiss; Paul G. Hoffman, Council of Foreign Relations and U.S. delegate to the U.N.; The Director of the International Monetary Fund; F.C.L. Astor, editor of the *Observer*; Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank); Gabriel Hauge, who "tells Ike what to think" according to the *Wall St. Journal*; Robert Bowie, U.S. Secretary of State for Policy Planning; Denis Healey, future Defence Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer; David Rockefeller, President of Chase National Bank; Paul Nitze, Director of U.S. State Dept. Policy Planning; Alexander Sachs, of Goldman, Sachs & Co., international bankers; Dean Rusk, then President of the Rockefeller Foundation; J.L.S. Steele, Chairman of the British International Chamber of Commerce; Pierre Commin, Secretary of the French Socialist party; George Ball, future U.S. State Dept. official, now senior partner of Lehman Brothers, international bankers, who was a key figure in the E.E.C. negotiations; and Joseph H. Retinger, one of the originators of the European Movement and former Polish Charge d'Affaires in the Soviet Union.

All these people have one thing in common. They are all internationalists, and all dedicated to the creation of a One World system. And they are conspirators.

That is the only word for powerful and wealthy men who meet secretly in remote places to discuss matters which apparently do not bear the light of day. As A.K. Chesterton writes: "Let there be no doubt about this business. When people like Frankfurter, Dean Acheson and Cyrus Eaton foregather, it is not for the purpose of amiable chats and mutual back-scratching. If the Bilderberg conferences 'reach no conclusions and recommend no policies', it is because the conclusions have already been reached and the policies determined, so that delegates assemble to be told what the form is".

At the meeting of the Bilderberg Group which took place in Buxton, Derbyshire, in 1958, the conspirators took the most extraordinary security measures. The hotel where they met was completely cleared of guests and its staff was suspended from duty. It is believed that the documents used were so secret that their crates had to be stored in the local police station, and that throughout the proceedings they were in the custody of General C.V.R. Schuyler, Chief of Staff of S.H.A.P.E. Prince Bernhard appeared secretly on British soil without even bothering to announce his presence to the Queen, a customary protocol apparently considered unimportant at a gathering of super-rich One Worlders. Among those present were members of the Rockefeller family, J.H. Retinger, Dean Acheson, Walther Hallstein (E.E.C. Commission Chairman), and from Britain such minor functionaries as Joseph Grimond, Hugh Gaitskell and the ubiquitous Denis Healey.

"If it were possible", writes A.K. Chesterton, "to bring members of the Bilderberg Group before a Commission of Enquiry . . . they would have to give a more satisfactory answer than any yet offered about the need for a secret society technique so stringent that not even the honest waiters and waitresses at a Buxton hotel could be allowed within ear-shot of the conspirators. Until Prince Bernhard and his colleagues explain themselves, which is an improbable event, I propose to designate them as the chosen lackeys of the New York Money Power charged with the task of plotting to

bring into being a One World tyranny".

Participants at the 1965 Bilderberg meeting at a villa on Lake Como comprised an interesting assortment. Denis Healey was there, together with George Ball, then U.S. Under-Secretary of State; Brosio, Secretary-General of NATO; Robert Marjolin, vice-president of the European Community; Guido Carli, Governor of the Bank of Italy; and our own Lord Mountbatten, then Chief of the Defence Staff and an arch-internationalist.

ADVANCE TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Last year, the Bilderbergers met at the Gold Dolphin, a luxury hotel in Cesme, a small village in Turkey. The chairman, as usual, was Prince Bernhard. One would have thought it a matter of some public interest that Conservative leader Mrs Margaret Thatcher sat down with Denis Healey, Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sir Gordon Richardson, Governor of the Bank of England, around a conference table in Turkey, together with a host of mysterious Zionists and prominent international bankers including Sir Eric Roll, chairman of S.G. Warburg and Co. But so secret are the deliberations of the Bilderberg Group that not a word found its way into the British press about this strange event or its participants.

There is, in fact, no room for doubt about the aims of the Bilderberg Group. Powerful internationalists and financiers do not gather together in remote parts of the world for nothing or for discussions with no outcome. They meet for a purpose, and the purpose of men such as David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, the Rothschilds and the Warburgs is to advance the cause of World Government, as they have affirmed in word and deed. The only question remaining is: Who really runs the show? It is not Prince Bernhard, the aristocratic front-man and President of the World Wildlife Fund. And it is certainly not people like Margaret Thatcher, Denis Healey, or the favoured newspaper editors and industrialists who are invited along to be put partly "in the know". They are simply informed of decisions made elsewhere.

By whom? By people like Bernard Baruch or the Warburgs? The answer to that question is simply that the Warburgs don't take orders from the likes of Denis Healey.

THE MURDER OF THE TSR2

It is of some significance that the pay-off to Prince Bernhard alleged in evidence by the former Lockheed Chairman involved the purchase by Holland of 138 U.S. Starfighter aircraft in preference to British-made Hawker Hunters. It brings to mind the strange story of the TSR2, the magnificent British aircraft scrapped by Defence Minister Denis Healey in 1965.

A key figure on the Bilderberg Group Steering Committee has been a certain

Contd. on page 15

SOLZHENITSYN: WHAT THE PAPERS DIDN'T REPORT

NOT LONG after his expulsion from the Soviet Union, the novelist Alexandr Solzhenitsyn toured the United States and made a widely reported speech to the American Federation of Labour, in which he denounced the iniquities of the Communist system. A great deal of attention was focused on that speech by the British press and by newspapers throughout the Western world, but their accounts were of interest more for what they left out than for what they actually reported.


While extensive coverage was given to Solzhenitsyn's descriptions of the Soviet concentration camp system, the bloody history of the Russian Revolution and his criticisms of *detente*, there were certain remarkable passages which were entirely ignored by the press, and which showed Solzhenitsyn to have a clear understanding of the powerful international forces based in the West which have created and sustained Communism.

To judge from the impression given by the Press reports, one would scarcely have guessed that the Russians's speech contained the following remarkable and quite unremarked on observation:

"But just as we feel ourselves your allies here, there also exists another alliance — at first glance a strange one, a surprising one — but if you think about it, in fact, one which is well-grounded and easy to understand: this is the alliance between our Communist leaders and your capitalists.

"This alliance is not new. The very famous Armand Hammer, who is flourishing here today, laid the basis for this when he made the first exploratory trip into Russia, still in Lenin's time, in the very first years of the Revolution. He was extremely successful in this intelligence mission and since that time for all these 50 years, we observe continuous and steady support by the businessmen of the West of the Soviet Communist leaders.

"Their clumsy and awkward economy, which could never overcome its own difficulties by itself, is continually getting material and technological assistance. The major construction projects in the initial five-year plan were built exclusively with American technology and materials. Even Stalin recognised that two-thirds of what was needed was obtained from the West. And if today the Soviet Union has powerful military and police forces — in a country which is poor by contemporary standards — they are used to crush our movement for freedom in the Soviet Union, and we have Western capital to thank for this also.



Alexandr
Solzhenitsyn

"Let me remind you of a recent incident which some of you may know about: Certain of your businessmen, on their own initiative, established an exhibition of criminological technology in Moscow. This was the most recent and elaborate technology which here, in your country, is used to catch criminals, to bug them, to spy on them, to photograph them, to tail them, to identify criminals. This was taken to Moscow to an exhibition in order that the Soviet KGB agents could study it, as if not understanding what sort of 'criminals' would be hunted by the KGB.

"The Soviet government was extremely interested in this technology, and decided to purchase it. And your businessmen were quite willing to sell it. Only when a few sober voices here raised an uproar against it was this deal blocked. But you have to realise how clever the KGB is. This technology didn't have to stay two or three weeks in a Soviet building under Soviet guard. Two or three nights were enough for the KGB there to look through it and copy it. And if today, persons are being hunted down by the best and most advanced technology, for this I can also thank your western capitalists.

"This is something which is almost incomprehensible to the human mind: that burning greed for profit and power which goes beyond all reason, all self-control, all conscience.

"I must say that Lenin foretold this whole process. Lenin, who spent most of his life in the West and not in Russia, who knew the West much better than Russia, always wrote and said that the western capitalists would do anything to strengthen the economy of the USSR . . . And in a difficult moment, at a party meeting in Moscow, he said: 'Comrades, don't panic. When things go very hard for us, we will give a rope to the bourgeoisie, and the bourgeoisie will hang

itself'.

"Then Karl Radek, who was a very resourceful wit, said: 'But Vladimir Ilyich, where are we going to get enough rope to hang the whole bourgeoisie?'"

"Lenin effortlessly replied: 'They'll supply us with it'."

PROFOUND SELF-DECEPTION

Later, Solzhenitsyn spoke frankly of the alliance of the democracies with the Soviet Union during the Second World War, another unreported aspect of his speech. In his view, the West (or rather its controlling interests) had cynically procured an alliance with Communism in order to defeat Germany. Observing that Tsarist Russia had executed an average of 17 persons per year, while in 1941 the Communists were shooting 40,000 people every month, Solzhenitsyn stated:

"Thus, that which had made it difficult for the democratic West to form an alliance with pre-revolutionary Russia had, by 1941, grown to such an extent and still did not prevent the entire united democracy of the world — England, France, the United States, Canada, Australia — from entering into a military alliance with the Soviet Union. How is this to be explained? How can we understand it? . . . It was a deliberate device. Democracy did not want to defend itself. It wanted to defend another totalitarian system, the Soviet totalitarian system."

On this "deliberate device" Solzhenitsyn commented simply:

"In terms of simple calculation, how shortsighted, what profound self-deception."

And after the war began the outright capitulation of the West to the demands of Soviet Communism, a consistent theme in Solzhenitsyn's denunciation of Western policy:

"Something that is incomprehensible to the ordinary human mind has taken place. We over there, the powerless, average Soviet people, couldn't understand, year after year and decade after decade, what was happening. How were we to explain this? England, France, the United States, were victorious in World War II. Victorious states always dictate peace: they receive firm conditions; they create the sort of situation which accords with their philosophy, their concept of liberty, their concept of national interest.

"Instead of this, beginning with Yalta, your statesmen of the West, for some inexplicable reason, have signed one capitulation after another. Never did the West or your President Roosevelt impose any conditions on the Soviet Union for obtaining aid. He gave unlimited aid, and then unlimited concessions. Already at Yalta, without any necessity, the occupation of Mongolia, Moldavia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania was silently recognised. Immediately after that, almost nothing was done to protect eastern Europe, and seven or eight more countries were surrendered."

Industrial Front

COMMON STRUGGLE

ABOUT 2,000 Asians crowded into the Dominion Theatre in Southall, Middlesex, recently, to celebrate India's Republic Day. The event was organised by the Marxist-orientated Indian Workers' Association. On the platform were Mr. Gordon McLennan, Gen. Sec. of the Communist Party, Mr. Alex Lyon, Home Office Minister, and Mr. Michael Foot, Employment Minister. That's right the **Employment Minister!** The picture of this event on the front page of the Communist *Morning Star* even amazed this writer. What the hell are two Ministers of the Crown doing on the same platform as the country's top Communist? And what the hell is Michael Foot doing attending what amounts to a Black Power meeting when he has over 1½ million reasons to spend his every waking minute trying to solve the nation's unemployment problem?

According to the *Morning Star*, Mr. Foot spoke of the "common struggle of working people in India and Britain". So when the unemployed British workers next collect their dole, they do so in the knowledge that not only is Mr. Foot just "too busy" to do anything but really only regards them as on a level with Asians anyway. It's a mercy for the Employment Minister that this meeting didn't receive more widespread publicity, because if it had, quite a few of those 1½ million workers would have been keen to engage in a little "common struggle" personally with Mr. Michael Foot!

DEVIL'S CHARITY

ONE of the nastiest cogs in Britain's race-mixing industry must surely be the deceptively-named Runnymede Trust. The Trust was established in 1968 as a 'charity' concerned with 'educating' the public on race relations. Its Trustees include leading members of big business (i.e. Adrian Cadbury, chairman CBI Economic Committee), and the decadent aristocracy — all presumably anxious to re-educate us proles for our new role as underlings to the black immigrant.

The Trust has its own Industrial Unit, which circulates subtle propaganda designed to instil into white workers and employers a guilt complex regarding alleged or potential 'discrimination'.

The Unit was founded in 1970, with the financial backing of the Rowntree Trust. Patriots will recall that the Rowntree Trust also finances the black terrorist movements operating in Rhodesia. The so-called "trade union liaison officer" for the Unit is a Mr. Tom Sibley, who, in his spare time, is

extremely active for the Communist Party. And a former director of the Runnymede Trust, Dipak Nandy, is also an ex-Communist.

I repeat, one of the nastier cogs in an already reprehensible business.

MINING SUCCESS

BRITISH miners produced almost 700,000 tons more coal in the last quarter than in the same quarter a year ago, according to Sir Derek Ezra, Chairman of the National Coal Board. In the September to December quarter 1974, output was 30,044,000 tons. In 1975 it was 30,743,000 tons. This increase represented a bonus saving to the balance of payments of around £20m.

In a recent letter to the *Times*, Sir Derek pointed out that the British coal industry was the most cost-effective in Europe, according to United Nations figures. And he added: "Power stations, factories, homes and other users, by making the greatest use of home-produced coal instead of imported oil and coal, are clearly acting in the national interest".

RED ROLLS

WORK is about to begin at the Rolls-Royce company on the powerful Spey turbofan jet engines — destination Communist China. The company concluded a £100 million deal with Red China in December. This will enable China to construct a new generation of war-planes, replacing outmoded MiG jet fighters, and to improve alarmingly its offensive potential.

When Rolls chairman Sir Kenneth Keith signed this agreement, did he not remember that only 20 years ago the same Communist regime was busy **killing British servicemen in Korea?** And that even today it has designs on Hong Kong where many British servicemen and women are based?

If Rolls-Royce needs the orders that badly, why doesn't Sir Kenneth call publicly for the British Government to expand our own dangerously-small R.A.F.? This would augur far better for the prestige and long-term security of Rolls-Royce than shoring up the most aggressive Communist regime in the world.

OPPORTUNITY UNDEREXPLOITED

BOTH the International Socialists and the Communist Party are behind rallies on unemployment, to be held respectively on 20th and 27th March in London.

The I.S. front organisation, the "Right To Work Campaign", is marching down from Manchester. It has the backing of some Left-Labour M.P.s and rank and file union

committees, and could attract sizeable numbers. The rival C.P.-backed "National Assembly" has already received substantial labour movement support and could even be larger than the November lobby of Parliament. Because of the Wilson Government's appalling record, it is understandable why so many disgruntled workers and labour movement organisations — who in ordinary circumstances would have no truck with Communist-inspired demos — are attracted to them now. In their eyes, the extremists are at least doing something.

All this demonstrates how short-sighted and even dangerous it is for Nationalists to ignore the opportunity to work within the labour movement. Most NF members are inclined towards activity in a rightist milieu, and this leaves a massive **free field for the Communists.** In theory, Nationalists have the advantage because Communists, by the very nature of their class ideology, are virtually restricted to working in one sphere; whereas Nationalists, with their race ideology, are free to work in any area. In reality, however, this advantage is underexploited.

Now that the National Front is united again, **Nationalists at every level in the party should ponder on these facts, because as the crisis deepens, the National Front could ignore the labour movement at its peril.**

RHODESIA STANDS FIRM

Contd. from page 9

can do in the face of the gloomy situation I have outlined. I believe that there is only one course open to us — to fight on; with courage, determination and faith in our own destiny; to demonstrate those qualities which enable the free world to win against the heavy odds which confronted them in the last World War. The only alternative is to surrender to the forces of evil, which, I am sure, is an unthinkable to you as it is to me. I have no doubt which course Rhodesians will choose.

My remarks this evening have been directed mainly at Rhodesians, but I hope the outside world will also take note of them. In particular, I trust that they will not be misled into believing that because Mozambique and Angola surrendered to terrorism, Rhodesia will do likewise. The people of Mozambique and Angola did not surrender — the Metropolitan Government in Portugal surrendered on their behalf. The fundamental difference is that in Rhodesia there is no Metropolitan Government to surrender on our behalf. We made certain of that when we assumed our independence ten years ago.

WHY DID NIXON GO TO CHINA?

THE suggestion that former U.S. President Richard Nixon visited China recently "as private citizen representing nobody but himself", and at the sentimental whim of Chairman Mao, should strike the worldly-wise as incredible. As the world's press have been at pains to try and foster that belief, then we can be quite sure that the suggestion is utterly untrue.

Mao has been gaga for several years past, and his power has been taken by bureaucrats. Red bureaucrats are not sentimentalists. Their actions stem from calculated decisions, not whimsy. In addition to this, "private citizens" who "represent nobody" just do not get accorded Head-of-State panoply by the governments of nations they visit for the purpose of a holiday — and Nixon was accorded the full fanfare treatment.

What then, was Mr. Nixon's visit all in aid of? I will hazard a guess that the purpose of the trip had much to do with the little publicised but vastly important outcome of Nixon's last visit to China four years ago, which he undertook as President of the U.S.

At the conclusion of that *bona fide* state visit, the American and Chinese governments issued a long *communiqué* which contained no reference to any tangible agreement or arrangement, other than a desire for 'peace' and a greater exchange of table-tennis teams between the two nations. Yet months of delicate negotiations went into the planning of the visit. Sinister and reptilian Henry Kissinger, then Nixon's foreign policy advisor, had made secret plane trips to China in order to slip propositions into the ears of the bureaucrats.

Surely all that effort and all that planning — and all those top secret conferences which took place during the state visit itself (in-between the banquets, the parades and the ballet) — had not been in aid of Sino-American ping-pong?

USURERS BENEFIT

No indeed. As weeks and months went by, tit-bits of information emerged which indicated that, while little of benefit had emerged for the American nation and people, much had been wrought for the benefit of the International Financial fraternity, whose base of operations is, for the moment, the United States.

The first benefit for the Usurers was that, for the first time, Communist China would borrow from abroad in order to finance its industrialisation programme. This decision more than any other indicated that Mao had lost his power. Mao had previously always insisted that it was better to go without than to borrow. He used to boast that China's entire industrial development, thus far, had been paid for out of the wealth created by the effort and output of the Chinese people, and not by means of loans from abroad.

It seems that the bureaucrats who took over from Mao do not possess his stark idealism, and allowed themselves to be persuaded that China's backwardness and over-population problems were such that unless industrialisation came very much more quickly than Mao's methods would provide for, crisis and disintegration would become rife and might produce a "counter-revolutionary" situation.

As there is never a contest in the minds of bureaucrats anywhere between the preservation of principles and self-preservation, Mao's inheritors called in the International Usurers. They were very ready to oblige because they knew that China had collateral in the form of vast reserves of mineral

resources, especially oil. The usurers also knew that the Chinese had been unable to develop these resources (a) because they were located offshore or in other almost inaccessible places, (b) because they did not have the technology to do so, and (c) because they did not have the cash to buy the technology.

STANDARD OIL

It was not such a surprise, therefore, that in addition to deciding to borrow from Wall Street — especially from the Chase Manhattan Bank, owned by the Rockefellers — they also agreed to give the Standard Oil Co. the contract to develop and exploit China's vast oil resources. Standard Oil, of course, is also owned by the Rockefellers. So is Kissinger.

Kissinger, who set up the Nixon state visit of four years ago, was 'formerly' a Rockefeller employee and a prominent member of the Council on Foreign Relations, which is an 'independent' think-tank advising the U.S. State Department on foreign policy matters, and which is funded almost wholly by the Rockefeller empire.

Since Nixon and Kissinger secured all these goodies from the Chinese, the Usurers have moved fast. The recent issue of the Chinese Government's *Peking Review* reveals that China's production of oil has gone up from 20 millions tons per year in 1970 to 70 or 75 million tons in 1975. 1975 had seen a 20 percent increase in oil production. By 1980 200 million tons of oil per annum will be produced.

China's railway network had been increased by 20 per cent, and an entirely new railway network in the remote but oil-rich Western regions was being laid. Deep water wharves were also being built in a number of harbours capable of taking 100,000 ton tankers. An "American" company was supplying £2 million worth of oil pipe-laying equipment. A "West German" company was soon to build a giant petro-chemical complex near Peking. Natural gas from China would soon be supplied to Japanese industry.

As the Nixon/Kissinger official visit was responsible for all this fabulous development, it is not unreasonable to assume that Nixon's recent "private" visit was not unconnected with these matters.

POWER STRUGGLES

It is fantastic to contemplate the idea that the discredited and corrupt Nixon could still be used by the forces of International Finance as their political contact man with the Red Chinese leadership. But the Reds would not give a damn about Nixon's abuses of power while he was U.S. President, since those abuses are as nothing compared to their own horrendous deeds.

That being so, and as Nixon undoubtedly was able to develop a series of close personal contacts with the Red Chinese leadership whilst in office and as a result of his state visit (and contacts of that kind are always of immense value), those at the top of the brotherhood of International Finance saw no percentage in being squeamish about using Nixon as their representative once again.

Nixon's visit to China last February was particularly timely in view of the death of Prime Minister Chou En Lai, which had been long expected due to a protracted serious illness. Chou's death brought out into the open a power-struggle among the bureaucrats.

Power struggles lead to political instability,

and instability in any set-up in which the Usurers have heavy investments and huge profit expectations quite understandably gives the Wall Street vampires heartburn.

All this might not seem too important to British readers. China is a long way away. But it should be remembered that the same forces of International Finance, which are involved in proping up a terrible Communist dictatorship over the most populous nation on earth, are the same forces which are developing "Britain's" oil resources in the North Sea, which are buying up (and then closing down) ever greater slices of British industry, and which hold our nation and its rotten politicians in the grip of unpayable debt.

We ignore what the Usurers are doing elsewhere in the world at our peril.

Attacks on NF leaders hushed up by media

A VICIOUS attack on three NF leaders during the recent by-election at Coventry was deliberately hushed up by almost the whole of the mass media.

On Saturday, February 28th, 700 to 800 NF supporters assembled to march through the city in support of their candidate Andrew Fountaine. A left-wing mob of about half that size assembled with the usual intention of demonstrating against the march.

Shortly before the march was due to begin, Mr Fountaine, accompanied by John Tyndall, Martin Webster and about four or five NF members were leaving the NF committee rooms in order to walk to the march assembly point, when a crowd of about 50 of the leftists turned up to attack them and the building.

Mr Fountaine was thrown to the ground and kicked many times. Mr. Tyndall, while going to his aid, was also kicked and hit by a flying stone, sustaining a cut on the side of the head. Mr Webster was also assaulted, and flying bricks smashed three panes in the windows of the committee rooms.

A few days earlier, Mr Webster had been subjected to another assault by a gang of black youths at Clapham Junction Station. He was hit on the back of the head by a brick and had to go to hospital to have seven stitches.

The facts of Mr Webster's earlier assault were made known to the media by the NF Press Office, while the attack at Coventry was witnessed by several Press men and filmed by their cameras. Nevertheless, the next morning the incident was totally ignored by all the national papers except the *Sunday Telegraph*, which in a very tiny report did not mention who precisely had been assaulted. All TV news broadcasts completely ignored the attack, although it was mentioned briefly on one sound broadcast. The following day, Monday, the story received minor attention in only two national papers.

These attacks were news by any standards, but not of course, when the National Front was involved. If any other candidate and party leaders had been assaulted during a parliamentary by-election it would certainly have been splashed on the front pages. Particularly disgraceful was the complete blackout on television when the incident had in fact been filmed by TV crews.

Mr Ron Davison of Wolverhampton, who was among those who valiantly helped the NF leaders against the attackers, was arrested by the police and spent the weekend in the cells.

THE JEWISH QUESTION: OUT IN THE OPEN OR UNDER THE CARPET?

Contd. from page 7

solved to pick a quarrel with it. This has been borne out in the book *Oswald Mosley* by Robert Skidelsky, himself a Jew and therefore one hardly likely to have prejudices either against Jewry or for Mosleyite Fascism. He writes of Mosley's party:

"... Some Jews even joined. The party line had been settled and there it was to remain officially for almost two years.

"What started to change it was the attitude of the Jews themselves, and they must take a large share of the blame for what subsequently happened. From the earliest days... a Jewish body... sent round van-loads of Jews all over the country to break up black-shirt meetings."

DECLARATION OF WAR

The unavoidable fact that we have to face is that sections of Jewry — and sections not rejected or condemned by official and senior Jewish bodies such as the Jewish Board of Deputies — have made it their business to declare war on movements of nationalism in Britain, and this reflects the attitude of Jews to nationalism in every country in the world except Israel and to every racial movement in the world except that of the Jews themselves.

So long as this attitude remains, and so long as Jews are to the fore in promoting Communism and world government, fuel is going to be given to those who maintain that there is a Jewish conspiracy for world power as outlined in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. If evidence of such a conspiracy is to be refuted and the *Protocols* consigned to the dustbin of discredited fantasies where all Jews would like to see it, there has got to be, I would maintain, a change of heart on the part of Jewry whereby it recognises the right of other nations to practise their own brands of nationalism and patriotism, as do the Jews, and to take steps to safeguard their own racial integrity with the same fervour as that shown by Jews in their opposition to inter-marriage on the part of their young to non-members of the Jewish community.

'The Jewish Question' consists of the fact that Jewry hitherto has been unprepared to do this, and 'anti-semitism' as a doctrine is nothing more than a natural Gentile reaction to this fact. So long as there is no change in this state of affairs, and so long as Jewry maintains towards our movement and to all manifestations of nationalism in our country the attitude that "we have to fight you", this journal is going to have to talk about the Jewish Question as a central issue in the struggle for the salvation of British nationhood. The day when we no longer have to do this will be the day when Jewry is prepared to make the same laws for others as it makes for itself. No-one will welcome that day more than I.

PRINCE BERNHARD AND THE BILDERBERG CONSPIRATORS

Contd. from page 11

Shepard Stone, who with Joseph Retinger set up the behind-the-scenes arrangements for Wall St. money to come into the European Movement to finance propaganda for the Common Market. (Interesting that Retinger, a former Charge d'Affaires of Communist Poland to Communist Russia should act as a funnel for Wall St. bankers.)

Denis Healey first met Stone at the Bilderberg meeting in Fiuggi, Italy, in 1957. Paymaster General Reginald Maudling was there, and topics discussed included European free trade and the Common Market. By this time Stone had risen to be international political head of the Ford Foundation.

Healey recalled later: "I took him (Stone) out for a walk in a heavy mist under the wet plane trees and said we were starting this thing and we would like about 10,000 dollars to keep it afloat. He told me they never looked at anything under 100,000 dollars. But he was very interested in the idea, so if we revamped it and put in a formal request it would stand a good chance".

OUR DETERRENT SCRAPPED

This 'thing' turned out to be the Institute of Strategic Studies, in which Healey had taken an interest from the start and which was financed by the Ford Foundation to the tune of 650,000 dollars. Obviously the formal request turned out to have a very good chance indeed!

Later, in 1964, Healey became Minister of Defence, an appointment which signalled

the abandonment of a number of British aircraft projects, including the superb TSR2. The 'necessity' for abandoning this aircraft was explained to the public on television by — you've guessed it, the Director of the Institute of Strategic Studies. No mention was made, of course, of the role of Mr Healey and the Ford Foundation in providing this impartial 'expert' with the qualifications for endorsing the policy of Mr Healey.

A Bilderberg hatchet job, if ever there was one. Who, if anyone, received a pay-off for scrapping what amounted to Britain's independent nuclear deterrent remains a matter for speculation.

NF RALLIES

The National Front wants to bring a fresh degree of professionalism to the presentation of its major national rallies, and meetings such as the A.G.M.

We have a team of artists and designers who have done excellent work on *decor*, but the party wishes to supplement this team with experts on lighting and the relaying of taped or recorded music. The NF also needs large Union Jack flags for backdrop display.

Would members who can be of assistance in any of these areas please contact Richard Verrall at NF Headquarters.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):


British Isles:	£2.58
Overseas surface mail:	£2.52 unsealed
	£4.68 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£4.74 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
(unsealed)	Africa, Middle East
	£5.34 Australia, New Zealand,
	Far East

Discounts can be obtained for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies:	11p each
50—99 copies:	9p each
100—249 copies:	8p each
250 copies and over:	6p each

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex.



SIR: I would like to add my own absolute condemnation and disclaimer to that of John Tyndall in last month's *Spearhead* of the pamphlet produced by Mr J. Kingsley Read entitled *The right to survive*, and supposedly dealing with the proposed new race laws.

I was requested last year by Mr Read to prepare a detailed legal and constitutional analysis of the Labour White Paper on Race for supposed incorporation into a National Front policy pamphlet. At considerable personal expense in time, effort and money, I produced at short notice a ten foolscap page legal appreciation of the White Paper, which directly contradicted Mr Read's own draft in many places. I was personally assured that the published pamphlet would be legally impeccable and that the numerous manifest errors in Mr Read's draft would be corrected.

I was absolutely appalled, therefore, to receive a copy of the finished article with my name quoted amongst the titles as "legal advisor", and to read in the publication innumerable legal and constitutional errors of the grossest kind. At no time was I presented with a proof for vetting prior to printing, and clearly my legal submissions were completely disregarded by Mr Read and the other editors of the publication.

I wish to disassociate myself in every way with this publication and its editors, and to state that I regard it as politically, intellectually and legally ridiculous. It is a great discredit to the National Front and those responsible for its production.

ANTHONY REED-HERBERT
NF Organiser, Leicester Branch
Chairman, East Midlands Region

SIR: I have just come across a series of books called the *Bluffer's Guides* from Wolfe Publishing Ltd., and one book in particular, *Bluff Your Way in Literature*, is worth reading for the advice it gives on certain subjects. I quote:

"Politics. Your line of politics should be faintly but hardly definably left-wing liberal . . . However, if you must be political, then be extreme left-wing (although not Communist). You will have to be militant, and

may have to march in processions. If you can get fined a pound for civil disobedience or obstruction of the police, so much the better. Write to the papers, in any case, complaining that you and your wife and small child were all thrown into the fountain in Trafalgar Square when peaceably indulging in your right to create a public disturbance. Attack the police, although not physically. Do not be right-wing at all . . .

"Racism. If you suffer from sickness of this sort, forget it. The literary world is decent about such things, and not even the worst kind of fake will forgive you for taking him aside and telling him that International Jewry or Black Africa is behind the troubles of the world. Pretentious as they are (and as you must seem to be), none of the dominant groups on the literary scene today are racist.

"Drugs. Drugs, especially LSD, are in, and the taking of them should be admired and praised . . . Seem impressed, as drug taking is impressive.

"Vomit, menstruation etc. In poems and novels, these are not only in but also obligatory. All — not merely some — poems and novels, if they are to be major, must be about sickness and mental breakdown . . . A good example was one which dealt with the theme of a miscarriage in the bathroom. Badly written, filthy, insulting and hysterical, it is just the kind of verse that is nowadays needed for magazines."

To quote more would drive me up the

wall. But one wonders how just many cynical, ruthless and lying bluffers we have in the media.

The final ironic twist in this book of drivel is the author's statement in his Introduction that: "This book is a guide to how to get on in the literary world. It is not concerned with my own views or practice".

Is he himself double or treble bluffing?

G. COOPER,
Wolverhampton, Staffs.

SIR: Typical of the Labour government's obsession with furthering the cause of the black races is their insistence that Rhodesia must have majority rule, whilst paradoxically they insist on power-sharing in Northern Ireland.

Straying from one subject to another, now that we are presumably going to suffer another indignity in the shape of Licensing courts empowering magistrates to refuse licenses to clubs or pubs exercising discrimination, how long, I wonder, before any young couple wanting to adopt an orphan child will have no say in which nationality it is, as they too will be guilty of discrimination?

When will the people of this country wake up and put the ethnomasochists of Transport House where they belong — in the Bloody Tower.

G. FEWSON,
Kettering, Northants.

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th of the previous month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *Wilts & Gloucestershire Standard*.

Sir — On November 22, when National Front members were demonstrating in Swindon, Communist counter demonstrators were putting out their familiar, grossly misleading propaganda.

This included desecration of the cenotaph and the obnoxious inversion of fact, to the effect that "the people of Swindon fought to defend Britain against the sort of thing the NF wants to introduce."

The bare fact is that during the early part of the war to defeat Naziism and Fascism, Communists in Britain were in opposition to that war because Stalin had signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler.

This proves that these Communist hypocrites were more concerned with supporting Soviet Russia

than defeating Naziism or defending Britain against it.

Meanwhile, British patriots, many of whom have since formed a substantial part of the National Front, were willingly serving in the forces or in war work.

There was not one single Briton fighting in that war who had reason to consider he or she was fighting to turn Britain into a multi-racial state, where tyrannical race laws would be passed to stifle public criticism of Government immigration policies, and making a complete mockery of "free speech".

Neither did they consider they were fighting to create a state where crimes of violence would rise to an unprecedented level, when the culprits

would be treated with greater regard than the victims, and the police would be forced to complain about the absurdly inadequate sentences passed by the courts.

Few of them could have guessed they would see the day when Communists would be directing most of their energies attacking a party that openly opposed the power exercised upon us by Finance Capitalism.

Little though British patriots considered they were fighting for these things, they have most certainly been landed with them, and it is the National Front, not the Communists, who are now complaining.

R. D. Molesworth,
Hon. Secretary, Cheltenham and Gloucester Group, National Front.

Trouble shooting

Taxpayer to subsidise Establishment Parties

Lord Houghton of Sowerby (formerly Douglas Houghton of Labour) is Chairman of a special committee set up by Parliament to investigate state financial aid to political parties. It is believed that, when his committee's report comes to be published early this May, it will advocate that £6 million per annum — at any rate as a starter — should be made available from the Exchequer to subsidise political parties.

Before National Front members — or the members of any other new minority party — breath a sigh of relief and think to themselves that the days of sacrificial donations to the Cause are now over, they should know that the Houghton Committee was set up by the Conservative, Labour and Liberal politicians in Parliament; it is comprised of supporters of the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Parties, and, if they can possibly wangle it, this public money will only find its way into the coffers of the Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties.

In other words, the Establishment parties have got together to agree to use money (extorted by force of law from the taxpayer) to subsidise their own private political organisations. In future all taxpayers, whether or not they are supporters of the Tory, Labour or Liberal parties, will be paying subscriptions to those parties. No taxpayer can contract out of the subscription to the Establishment parties.

There are no two ways about it — this is utter corruption and tyranny. It is not, as proponents of the scheme assert, a "necessary measure designed to ensure the survival of multi-party democracy". It is a cynical fraud whereby the Establishment hopes to use other people's money to provide the parties which serve its interests with a permanent, built-in advantage over other parties who oppose the interests of the Establishment. The scheme is also designed to discourage any radical thinking on the part of people who hope to build their political careers within the Establishment structure.

On the basis of the results of the October, 1974, General Election the Conservative, Labour, Liberal, Scottish Nationalist, Welsh Nationalist and Ulster Unionist parties will all qualify for a slice of the cake. As the size of each slice would depend on (a) how many members each party got elected, and (b) what was the total national vote obtained by each party, the Conservative and Labour parties would get by far the biggest slices, the Liberals would get a much smaller though worthwhile slice, and the Nationalists and Unionists would be left

with a few crumbs.

New and developing parties such as the National Front, (which had 90 candidates in the field who attracted a total of 113,000 votes), would not get a penny because the party did not get any one of its candidates elected. The tax money paid out by those 113,000 voters would count for nothing. Their money would be divided up among the people they had chosen NOT to vote for! Yet the votes of unsuccessful candidates of parties which did manage to get some candidates elected would be taken into account.

In view of the fact that the whole of the news and information media is owned and controlled by the Establishment and used to promote support for the Establishment's political parties, and as it is unlikely that the Establishment will ever agree to replace the present unfair "winner takes all" voting system with an equitable proportional representation system, one can only conclude that the Establishment, through the Houghton Committee, is trying to make party politics at the Parliamentary level the exclusive preserve of the Establishment parties.

The Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties do not have a proprietorial right to power and places in Parliament — yet public money is going to be used as if they have. That is nothing short of tyranny — even though disguised behind a "multi-party" facade.

We can expect this Establishment tyranny to increase. Once the corrupt Houghton scheme is implemented in principle, then year by year the Establishment will vote itself bigger and bigger payments from public funds, so that within a decade the whole of the costs incurred by the Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties in fighting Parliamentary (and European) elections, including candidates' deposits, will be paid for by the taxpayer.

In order to further disadvantage non-Establishment parties, moves will be made to increase the amount of candidates' deposits in Parliamentary elections. Indeed, a campaign to do just this is already under way. Those who are promoting it, such as Paul Rose M.P., have already made it clear that they have one target in mind: the National Front.

If schemes like this really are implemented by the Establishment, then the Establishment must expect the inevitable reaction. "If people are systematically denied an equal opportunity to put their case and contend for power in a peaceful and law-abiding way, then they will hit back at the tyrants in their frustration with guns and bombs." This is not my analysis. It is the

analysis of numerous Conservative, Labour and Liberal politicians when finding explanations for the troubles in Northern Ireland.

Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Farce at Chelsea Old Town Hall

All of us are now getting a bit bored with the National Party 'split' saga — especially with reports being pumped out by the splinter group's chief fan and press spokesman, Martin Walker of *The Guardian*. His constantly repeated assertions that the splinter group has taken on "70 per cent of the National Front's membership" or his references to "what remains of the National Front" are quite pathetic.

This journalist staked his whole credibility on a sustained campaign designed to achieve three objectives. Those objectives were:—

1. The promotion of a 'Populist' faction within the NF.
2. The hounding out of political life of John Tyndall and myself.
3. The destruction of the NF as an effective racist and above all anti-Zionist British nationalist party.

It must now be evident to those who have sponsored and encouraged Walker's campaign — if not to the spiteful child himself — that the attempt to achieve the last two of the above-mentioned objectives has quite failed. All his predictions have come to nothing.

Let's look at the facts. Why did Walker not report the splinter group's Inaugural General Meeting? Because he would have had to report that only 187 persons bothered to attend it. That same hall, which seats 800, was filled to capacity on 11th October last year at the NF's last Annual General Meeting.

Why did Walker not report that Kingsley Read had been elected the Chairman of the governing body of the splinter group? Because Read came top of the poll in the elections to the NP's Central Committee with only 160 votes. In the elections to the NF National Directorate last September Read came second from top of the poll with more than 1,000 votes.

Why did Walker not give details of the debate at the splinter group's conference? Because a resolution promoted by the ultra-Populist wing of the NP designed to purge the splinter group's membership of all persons with a Nazi, Fascist or Communist background was thrown out by a sinister alliance of "ex-Nazis" and "ex-Communists".

This, of course, was very embarrassing for a new party founded (according to Walker) on the desire of its membership to part company with "two former members of the British Nazi Party". Half the North London membership of the splinter group stalked out of the hall, tearing up their membership cards.

Why did Walker not give full details of the results of elections to the Central Committee of the splinter group? Perhaps because it contains more ex-Nazis (to say nothing of 'ex'-Communists) than the Directorate of the National Front, and because the man whom Walker has promoted for two years as a popular folk hero (Roy 'Aramis' Painter) only came half-way up the list of elected candidates.

Martin Walker might like to know that a detailed history of the development of the Populist faction within the NF is being written. It will be dedicated to him.

JOHN TYNDALL ELECTED N.F. CHAIRMAN



At a meeting of the National Directorate held in London on the 6th February, Mr John Tyndall was elected Chairman of the National Front for the coming year. He takes over from Mr Andrew Fountaine, who became Acting Chairman of the NF after the recent departure of Mr Read.

John Tyndall returns to the leadership with a distinguished record. He led the National Front during the most successful years of its existence, from mid-1972 to 1974, a period in which the NF more than quadrupled its membership and won over 113,000 votes in 90 constituencies at the October 1974 General Election.

The tremendous growth of the NF throughout that period culminated in the frantic attempt by organised mobs of the extreme Left to "Stop the National Front" at Red Lion Square.

Carshalton By-Election

Mr Terry Denville-Faulkner, newly-elected Chairman of the Richmond & Kingston Branch of the National Front, is contesting Carshalton for the party in the coming by-election, now set for March 11th. Mr Denville-Faulkner, who is an actor and member of EQUITY, has been a member of the National Front for over six years.

Already the NF campaign has stimulated local interest in the party, and a number of new members from the area have joined the National Front as a result.

Richmond & Kingston Branch recently nominated Squadron-Leader John Harrison-Broadley D.F.C. to stand for the Richmond Constituency at the next General Election. The Squadron-Leader, who joined the R.A.F. in 1938 and was awarded the D.F.C. for action in the Mediterranean in 1941, has been a member of the National Front for some years and contested Brent at the last General Election.

Help this member

At Glasgow on 6th February, Mr Frank Burden, a member of Leeds Branch, was fined £100 after being found 'guilty' of threatening behaviour outside the hall in which the National Front held an anti-Common Market meeting during the Referendum campaign. In fact, Mr Burden was inside the hall at the time of the incident concerned.

Contributions to help this member pay his unjust fine would be greatly appreciated, and should be sent to the Treasurer of the Yorkshire Region: Mr Brian Spink, 2 Kelso Gardens, Leeds 2, West Yorks.

How Populism helps the Left

THIS journal has always maintained that what is known as 'populism' is merely a pathetically weak response to the unrelenting hostility directed at the National Front and its policies by the forces of the Establishment and the political Left. Unable to keep up the struggle, a few politically immature individuals have thought to themselves: "Perhaps if we moderate our policies a little, get rid of any 'fascist' taint and become 'popular', then we wouldn't have to put up with this harassment all the time".

This, of course, is exactly what the Left wants them to think. It is why they do it. Whether the aim is a watered-down National Front or a split in the party, the result is the same: a weakened National Front.

Confirmation from the Left that 'populism' is part of their own strategy of subversion appeared in an article in *Worker's Action*, organ of the International Communist League, which was devoted to the recent internal troubles in the National

Front. Although full of gross inaccuracies, the article nevertheless made one revealing statement:

"The activity of the Left has been another factor in this, constantly dogging their steps with reminders of the Nazi history they'd like to keep quiet, publicising their violence, and making it almost impossible for them to mount important meetings without physical opposition or the denial of public meeting facilities. Despite their boasts that the publicity has helped rather than hindered them, the Left's activities have undoubtedly demoralised a substantial section of the membership and hindered recruitment. The split in the NF certainly vindicates the policy of constant physical confrontation."

What this means is that constant confrontation and the 'Nazi' smear technique will, the Left hope, demoralise the weaker elements in the party and turn them into 'populist' sympathisers, in the belief that a 'moderate' image will put an end to left-

wing harassment. The result will be a split in the NF.

But we have news for the Left. The minority of weaklings and populists have now left the National Front, and the vast majority of our membership remain **hard-line** British Nationalists and patriots. In any struggle with us there will be no more demoralisation or cowardly retreats into 'populism'. We will win!

A MATTER OF APPERTAINMENT

"I am not a wealthy landlord, although this appertains in relation to what persons consider the word wealthy to mean."

from a letter by Gordon 'Brown' in the *Sunday Telegraph*, February 1st, 1976.

ANDREW FOUNTAINE STANDS FOR N.F. IN COVENTRY

Andrew Fountaine, Deputy Chairman of the National Front, has been nominated as our candidate in the Coventry N.W. by-election. As this issue of *Spearhead* goes to press, the date of the by-election has been brought forward by Labour to March 4th. This was done as soon as the news of Mr Fountaine's nomination as NF candidate appeared in the Coventry *Evening Telegraph*, together with details of the NF's "British Jobs for British Workers" march and rally set for the 6th March, which the Labour party hoped to thwart and render a post-election anti-climax. However, our rally was immediately brought forward to the 28th February in order to thwart the Labour party!

Andrew Fountaine has a long history of service to the Nationalist cause, and was a founder member of the National Front. In 1947, at the Conservative Party Conference in Brighton, he made the first nationalist speech, proposing the motion that the party "Should root out all alien, Communist and subversive influences in Britain and her Dominions overseas", and he attacked Zionist atrocities against British soldiers in Palestine. The speech received tumultuous applause, headlines in the Press, and the hatred of Woolton and Churchill, who expelled him from the party in 1948. In 1951 a total



ANDREW FOUNTAINE

prohibition was placed on him by Tory Central Office. After his expulsion, Mr Fountaine stood as Independent National Conservative candidate for Chorley, Lancs on policies identical to those of the NF, and lost the election by only 361 votes.

In 1953 Andrew Fountaine became President of the British National Party, one of the nationalist organisations which later merged to form the National Front. In 1968, when the National Front was founded, Mr Fountaine became Vice-Chairman of the party under A.K. Chesterton and stood for the NF in the 1968 by-election at Acton. Since his return to active politics in 1975, Mr Fountaine has been Deputy Chairman of the National Front.

All NF members owe a particular debt of gratitude to Mr Fountaine who, as Acting Chairman since the attempt by Mr Read to form a splinter group, made a great contribu-

tion to party unity. In particular it was the personal financial help of Mr Fountaine that enabled the NF to successfully defend the integrity of our Constitution in the High Court, and thereby save the party from the attempt to subvert it.

MOPPING UP

In last month's *Spearhead* appeared a full list of Branches and Groups which stayed solidly loyal to the National Front, as well as those few areas where there was still some disaffection.

Renewed support for the NF in a number of these areas, as well as pledges of loyalty from other groups, has since been received.

Groups in Glasgow, Poole, Hastings, Eastbourne, Loughborough, Havering and Stafford which were not listed last month, have all notified H.Q. wishing to record their loyalty to the NF. In Kingsley Read's own area of Blackburn, thanks to the work of N.Lancs Regional Organiser David Riley, one third of the NF activists have remained to revitalise the Branch, while in Preston three quarters of the activists have stayed loyal. Blackpool is solidly in support of the NF after the departure of their Chairman.

In Crawley, after swift intervention by Brighton Branch Chairman Charles Parker, the majority of members have returned to the National Front, and a new Parliamentary candidate has been selected for the constituency. East Herts has joined West Herts in support of the NF, leaving some disaffection only in Hitchin and Stevenage. Barnet has stayed solidly loyal.

In the trouble spot of Fulham and Chelsea a considerable number of dormant activists have been contacting NF H.Q. and coming back into the fold following the departure of the young red element. The result will be a new NF Fulham & Chelsea Branch with even more members than we had previously. In Southwark too, a large number of activists have returned to the NF.

The position in the Hounslow/Feltham & Heston area has been consolidated. Losses in Feltham & Heston have been counteracted by a merger of loyalists from that Branch with members of the former Brentford & Isleworth Branch to form a new, strong Hounslow Branch. This merger has been welcomed by an anonymous donation of £150 for an election deposit, while a number of dormant activists have rejoined the Branch.

On Merseyside the populists attempted to manipulate the Regional Council by creating a number of bogus groups. After a trouble-shooting visit there by Martin Webster, these have been abolished and the NF in the area has been consolidated into a Liverpool & Merseyside Branch, while the Region has been strengthened by forming a Merseyside and Greater Manchester Region.

OBITUARY

Air Vice Marshall Pidcock

It is with deep regret that we announce the death after a long illness of Air Vice Marshall Geoffrey Pidcock, a fine British patriot and a stalwart member of the National Front. He was 78.

Air Vice Marshall Pidcock was Director of Armament at the wartime Ministry of Aircraft Production, where he was responsible for a wide range of new weapons, including the "blockbuster" bomb.

Educated at Haileybury and Imperial College, he joined the Royal Flying Corps in 1916 and served in France, being awarded the Croix de Guerre.

Between the wars he served in India and Iraq, as well as at home. He was appointed Director of Armament in 1941. In 1945 he was appointed President of the Ordnance Board, and two years later he became the last Director-General of Armament at the Air Ministry.

Promoted Air Vice Marshall in 1947, he was made CBE in 1946 and CB in 1948.

Air Vice Marshall Pidcock joined the National Front in 1973, and in that year laid the wreath at the Cenotaph on the NF's Remembrance Day parade. A patriot to the last, he used to go out and help the local group with leafletting in his home town of Andover, Hants.

N.F. PROTESTS AGAINST I.R.A. RALLY

Nearly 200 National Front members turned out in the snow on Feb. 1st. to express public outrage at the disgraceful 'Bloody Sunday' demonstration, held annually by Communists and I.R.A. supporters.

The sight of this atrocity-supporting rabble assembling on Shepherd's Bush Green was just too much for some of our lads, who, with their magnificent Union Jacks flying, were unable to resist making a charge across the Green. At first, the Red mob did not take the charge seriously, but as it got closer and closer the expression on their features changed from one of anxiety to panic and then to sheer terror. Some of our lads (their outrage was understandable) managed to find a gap in the thin police line

and, despite being outnumbered ten to one, advanced into the middle of the alien mob. Red banners were torn and "Victory to the I.R.A." placards were smashed. At this point the Reds were literally screaming for help, so the police regrouped with reinforcements to force the young patriots back. Despite their overwhelming numbers, the Communists and I.R.A. supporters had to rely on what they regard as the 'fascist' police to protect them.

By this time the older patriots had caught up, and all were surrounded by a police cordon.

The same enthusiasm and more pre-planning should make next year's 'Bloody Sunday' demonstration the last ever in London.

Report from Bristol and the South West

The National Front's growth in the West Country, although perhaps not as spectacular as in other Regions, has maintained a steady expansion in recent years. The increasing number of groups in the Region during the past year has also been encouraging, with two new groups being formed in the past three months in Stroud (Glos.) and Swindon (Wilts.). The quality of the Region's organisation in general has improved greatly in recent years, with many local Branches and Groups in the South-West supporting each others political activities.

Praise is due particularly to S.W. Area Organiser Paul Watson, Graham Manning, who pioneered the growth of the party in Bristol and the South West generally, and Philip Gannaway, Chairman of Bristol Branch who regularly pushes the NF into the local headlines.

The largest Branch in the region is Bristol, which fielded two Parliamentary candidates in the last two General Elections, fighting the notorious leftist Tony Benn in Bristol South-West. In 1970, Bristol managed to field 14 candidates in the local Council elections, and plans to fight at least 10 seats this year.

Effective demonstrations are an important key to local growth, and Bristol Branch has done very well in this field of activity. An Anti-Common Market demonstration and rally was mounted last May, which attracted wide publicity locally, and even nationally. The rally prompted over 800 screaming Bristol University students and left-wing drop-outs to mobilise their own counter-demonstration, in an attempt to prevent the NF marching through the centre of Bristol. However, their attempt proved unsuccessful, and after the march a packed indoor rally heard NF speakers



PHILIP GANNAWAY

including Martin Webster attack the E.E.C.

Bristol Branch also received widespread publicity last November when they organised a demonstration against the Government's latest White Paper on Race Relations, at a meeting where Home Secretary Jenkins spoke to a "specially selected" group of Co-Operative Party members. Although the meeting was an all-ticket affair, five Bristol Branch members managed to get tickets, and once inside, expressed their opinion of the Government's plans in no uncertain terms, sending shock-waves of horror throughout the audience where the 'invited' guests expected the Home Secretary's speech to be delivered amid rapturous attention. Much credit for this and other local activities must go to Bristol's new local activities Organiser, Mr Ray Dowler, who is a tireless worker for the party.

Bristol Branch is particularly skilful

in bringing the National Front to the public's attention through active participation in local issues. This campaign has been successfully led by Philip Gannaway, an active trade unionist and delegate to Bristol Trades Council. The Press item reproduced on this page gives some idea of the Branch's activity, including the publication of a 16 page report on housing in Bristol and the city's environmental needs which is now in the hands of Bristol's Director of Housing. Its recommendations are shortly to be discussed, along with the views of other local bodies, by the City's Housing Committee. The Branch has also campaigned against the City and County's growing debt, attempting to force the Council to reveal just how much the ratepayer pays to service the interest on Council debt.

Gloucester and Cheltenham Groups are also making steady progress and are hoping shortly to be considered for Branch status. Under the direction of their local organiser, Mr Bob Rhodes, the two groups have mounted several demonstrations in their area which have gained them much local publicity. Other tireless workers for the NF in the Cheltenham and Gloucester area include Muriel Hornchurch and their local chairman, Mr Martin Pask.

NF activists have also been very busy in Plymouth recently, and in Dorset much credit must go to Mr Jack Swaby for his great efforts in helping to promote a steady NF growth rate in a part of Britain where in past years our movement has found difficulty in making headway. Jack Swaby was awarded the NF Gold Badge at the last A.G.M. for his many years of service to the party.

Front campaign

A CAMPAIGN to get details of local councils' debts and interest charges

printed on rate demands, is being launched by the National Front.

But Bristol city council and the Environment Department have already refused a request for this from NF Bristol secretary Mr. Philip Gannaway.

The city council's treasurer Mr. Ralph Egarr told

him it could not be done because the amount of space on the demand notes is limited.

Mr. Gannaway said last night: "We will never cease in our campaign. Behind these debt figures lies the true history of our inflationary problems."

One of the many press reports won by Bristol Branch

FIND OUT ABOUT THE NATIONAL FRONT

Send 15p for information pack.

Name

Send 20p extra for copy of manifesto for General Election of October, 1974.

Address

To: NATIONAL FRONT
91 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON, MIDDX.
(Tel. 01-977 2452)

I enclose